

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application, claims 5-10 are withdrawn from consideration and claims 1-4 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the allegedly admitted prior art (APA; paragraph references to US 2005/0263207) in view of Saitoh (US 6,228,153).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, positioning a plurality of liquid delivery units, which are actuatable by a single drive shaft, each for intermittently drawing in and discharging a fluid at a constant rate by progressively pressing a flexible resilient tube with presser rollers, parallel to each other, discharging flows of the plastic raw material liquid at different times from each other from said liquid delivery units, combining the flows of the plastic raw material liquid discharged from said liquid delivery units, with each other, and introducing the combined plastic raw material liquid into a casting polymerization mold.

A non-limiting exemplary embodiment of the method of introducing a plastic raw material liquid according to Claim 1 is shown in Figs. 1 and 2. In this exemplary embodiment, the first pump head 7a and the second pump head 7b, which are juxtaposed, of the liquid delivery unit 7 are fixedly mounted on the single drive shaft 71, and are simultaneously driven by the single drive shaft 71 to keep the presser rollers 72 in their relative positions. As a consequence of this single drive shaft configuration, the variation of the timing to draw in and discharge the

plastic raw material liquid 3 is minimized, and the discharge of the plastic raw material liquid 3 may be stably averaged.

None of the applied prior art teaches or even fairly suggests this feature. Accordingly, even if the APA and Saitoh are combined as suggested by the Examiner, the suggested combination fails to disclose “positioning a plurality of liquid delivery units, which are actuatable by a single drive shaft,” as recited in claim 1.

In particular, the APA is illustrated in FIG. 5. As illustrated in this figure, only a single liquid delivery unit is attached to the drive shaft. Thus, the APA fails to disclose a plurality of liquid delivery units actuatable by a single drive shaft.

Additionally, in the Office Action the Examiner relies on FIGS. 4(a) and 4(c) of Saitoh as disclosing “positioning a plurality of delivery units each of intermittently drawing in and discharging fluid at a constant rate.” *See* Office Action, p. 3. However, no portion of Saitoh discloses that these delivery units are actuatable by a single drive shaft.

Consequently, neither of the applied references (APA or Saitoh) discloses nor even fairly suggests positioning a plurality of liquid delivery units which are actuatable by a single drive shaft. Thus, Applicants submit that even if they are combined as suggested, they fail to disclose all the features of amended claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Additionally, Applicants submit claims 2 -4 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 27, 2009

David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154